### **NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

### OFFICE OF TITLE I



### **2015-2016 TITLE I SCHOOLWIDE PLAN\***

\*This plan is only for Title I schoolwide programs that are <u>not</u> identified as a Priority or Focus Schools.

### SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

| DISTRICT INFORMATION                                      | SCHOOL INFORMATION                             |
|---|--|
| District: CAMDEN'S PROMISE CHARTER SCHOOL                 | School: Camden's Promise Charter School        |
| Chief School Administrator: DR. JOSEPH CONWAY             | Address: 879 Beideman Avenue Camden, NJ 08007  |
| Chief School Administrator's E-mail:jconway@camdencsn.org | Grade Levels: 5-8                              |
| Title I Contact: Jennifer Arasim                          | Principal: Dr. Joseph Conway                   |
| Title I Contact E-mail: jarasim@camdencsn.org             | Principal's E-mail: jconway@camdencsn.org      |
| Title I Contact Phone Number: 856 365-1000 ext152         | Principal's Phone Number: 856 365-1000 EXT 101 |

### **Principal's Certification**

The following certification must be made by the principal of the school. Please Note: A signed Principal's Certification must be scanned and included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

| Principal's Name (Print)                   | Principal's Signature   |  |
|--|---|--|
| As an active member of the planning commit | ultations related to the priority needs of my school and page tee, I provided input for the school's Comprehensive Newsin, including the identification of programs and activitie | eds Assessment and the selection of priority problems. |
| of the submission of the schoolwide Flan.  |   |  |

#### SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

#### **Critical Overview Elements**

- The School held 6 (number) of stakeholder engagement meetings.
- State/local funds to support the school were \$ \_\_\_\_\_\_, which comprised \_\_\_\_\_\_% of the school's budget in 2014-2015.
- State/local funds to support the school will be \$\_\_\_\_\_\_, which will comprise \_\_\_\_\_\_% of the school's budget in 2015-2016.
- Title I funded programs/interventions/strategies/activities in 2015-2016 include the following:

| Item   | Related to Priority Problem #   | Related to Reform Strategy  | Budget Line<br>Item (s) | Approximate<br>Cost             |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Salaries – Math Reasoning Teachers (Supplemental Math Program)                                     | Mathematics<br>Proficiency  | Increased<br>Learning Time  | 100-100                 | 140,450 + 10,420 in<br>Benefits |
| Salaries for 14 teachers -PARCC After<br>School Program  | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency  | Extended Day<br>Programs for Title<br>I students                  | 100-100 FICA<br>only    | 23,600 + 1,805 in<br>Benefits   |
| Salaries for 8 teachers – Promise<br>Summer Learning Program                                       | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency  | Extended Year<br>Programs   | 100-100 FICA<br>only    | 22,400 + 1,714 in<br>Benefits   |
| Software Instructional – LoTi,<br>Accelerated Reader, Ixl.com,<br>Measuring Up Live                | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency, Using<br>Technology in the<br>classroom | Instructional<br>Materials and<br>supplies for Title I<br>program | 100-600                 | 45,895                          |
| Textbooks and Workbooks –<br>Scholastic, Measuring Up Common<br>Core Literacy and Mathematics, etc | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency  | Instructional Materials and supplies for Title I program          | 100-600                 | 17,000                          |
| Supplies, Instructional –<br>Headphones, Science World,  | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency  | Instructional<br>Materials and                                    | 100-600                 | 15,700                          |

### SCHOOLWIDE SUMMARY INFORMATION - ESEA§1114

| National Geographic, Lakeshore<br>Learning, Fisher Scientific, Time Kids,<br>Overdrive, etc   |  | supplies for Title I<br>program                          |         |                                |
|---|--|--|---------|--------------------------------|
| Student Test Material – MAP Test  | LAL and Mathematics<br>Proficiency   | Instructional Materials and supplies for Title I program | 100-600 | 6,000                          |
| Salary – Teacher to oversee all programs run efficiently and to model many of the initiatives for the year  | Using Technology in the classroom, LAL and Mathematics Proficiency             | Increased<br>Learning Time                               | 200-100 | 50,000 + 13,000 in<br>Benefits |
| Consultant, Educational = Summer<br>BAM Institute LoTi, Job-embedded<br>Modeling LoTi, NWEA Training, Sarah<br>Tantillo Workshop and Support for<br>LAL staff | Using Technology in the classroom, LAL and Mathematics Proficiency             | Professional<br>Development<br>Activity                  | 200-300 | 24,100                         |
| Software non-instructional  | Classroom Walkthrough Quarterly reports, LoTi School Monitoring, Annual Report | Professional<br>Development<br>Activity                  | 200-600 | 9500                           |

### SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii): "The comprehensive plan shall be . . . - developed with the involvement of parents and other members of the community to be served and individuals who will carry out such plan, including teachers, principals, and administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this title), and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school;"

#### Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee

#### Select committee members to develop the Schoolwide Plan.

**Note**: For purposes of continuity, some representatives from this Comprehensive Needs Assessment stakeholder committee should be included in the stakeholder/schoolwide planning committee. Identify the stakeholders who participated in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and/or development of the plan. Signatures should be kept on file in the school office. Print a copy of this page to obtain signatures. **Please Note**: A scanned copy of the Stakeholder Engagement form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan.

#### \*Add lines as necessary.

| Name               | Stakeholder Group                | Participated in Comprehensiv e Needs Assessment | Participated<br>in Plan<br>Development | Participated<br>in Program<br>Evaluation | Signature |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------|
| William Helmbrecht | Supervisor                       | X   | Х                                      |  |           |
| Marta Cruz         | Parent                           |   |  |  |           |
| Melanie James      | Community-Based Organization     |   |  |  |           |
| Jennifer Arasim    | Vice Principal – Title I Contact | Х   | Х                                      | Х  |           |
| Tamika Brown       | Supervisor                       | Х   | X                                      |  |           |
| Nicole Harris      | Supervisor/ Social Worker        | Х   | X                                      |  |           |
| Dr. Joseph Conway  | Principal                        | Х   | X                                      | Х  |           |
| Rochelle Baughn    | Business Administrator           | Х   | X                                      |  |           |
| Fred Alden         | Supervisor                       | Х   | X                                      |  |           |
| Justin Schoonmaker | Content Area Specialist          | Х   | X                                      |  |           |
| Aaron Brown        | Content Area Specialist          | Х   | Х                                      |  |           |
| DaNeen Satchell    | Supervisor                       | Х   | Х                                      |  |           |
| Harry Reed         | Content Area Specialist          | X   | Х                                      |  |           |

### SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

#### **Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee Meetings**

#### Purpose:

The Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee organizes and oversees the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process; leads the development of the schoolwide plan; and conducts or oversees the program's annual evaluation.

Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee meetings should be held at least quarterly throughout the school year. List below the dates of the meetings during which the Stakeholder/Schoolwide Committee discussed the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, Schoolwide Plan development, and the Program Evaluation. Agenda and minutes of these meetings must be kept on file in the school and, upon request, provided to the NJDOE.

| Date          | Location  | Topic                                    | Agenda | on File | Minute | s on File |
|---------------|---|--|--------|---------|--------|-----------|
| May 19, 2015  | CPCS Conference Room<br>(6 meetings occurred,<br>each period of the school<br>day so that all teaches<br>could attend)  | Needs Assessment                         | Yes    |         | Yes    |           |
| June 2, 2015  | CPCS Conference Room (7 meetings occurred, each period of the school day so that all teaches could attend, plus an additional meeting was had with the ELL staff, and one meeting with just Dr. Conway and Mrs. Arasim) | Plan Development                         | Yes    |         | Yes    |           |
| July 11, 2015 | CPCS Cafeteria –<br>12:30pm   | Informational Session                    | Yes    |         |        | No        |
| July 15, 2015 | CPCS Cafeteria – 2:00pm<br>and 6pm  | Program Evaluation/Informational Session | Yes    |         |        | No        |

#### SCHOOLWIDE COMPONENT: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT ESEA §1114(b)(2)(B)(ii)

#### School's Mission

A collective vision that reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs will capture the school's response to some or all of these important questions:

- What is our intended purpose?
- What are our expectations for students?
- What are the responsibilities of the adults who work in the school?
- How important are collaborations and partnerships?
- How are we committed to continuous improvement?

What is the school's mission statement?

Camden's Promise Charter School is designed to meet the needs of the at-risk youth of Camden. The mission statement demonstrates that Camden's Promise Charter School will develop its programs around two central concepts. The first is that the school will provide an environment which maximizes the student's potential for learning. This will be accomplished by developing a model program which utilizes the school, family, and community partnerships to bring the five fundamental resources deemed necessary for healthy child development by the President's Summit into a public entity to increase student achievement rates. To monitor this integration, the school will develop standards and benchmarks which can be used to hold parents and community members accountable for the academic success of their youth. The second concept is that the school will deliver a quality educational program which provides students with a strong academic foundation. The school and students will be held accountable by the educational standards and benchmarks developed by both the state and nation. The founders of Camden's Promise Charter School believe the mission of the school is an innovative approach to working with at-risk youth because it provides a framework for developing replicable community specific programs which integrate two systems for benchmarks together, community and academic, to increase student achievement levels. In so doing, a structure can be created which can hold the school system, parents, and community accountable for the success of their youth.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

# Evaluation of 2014-2015 Schoolwide Program \* (For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program in 2014-2015, or earlier)

1. Did the school implement the program as planned?

Yes the program was implemented as planned. We were able to complete our SIOP training that we carried over from the previous year, and all other activities as described in last year's plan.

2. What were the strengths of the implementation process?

The staff as whole is always the greatest strength. They can make any program successful by their hard work and determination. This year the Loti Mathematics Programs implementation was nearly flawless. This was the third year of the program so the students and staff were comfortable with it and utilized it wisely. At Camden's Promise Charter School our Mathematics scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6<sup>th</sup> grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7<sup>th</sup> grade, 17% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7<sup>th</sup> grade, in all three subject areas we exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade, only 14% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8<sup>th</sup> grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in both Mathematics and Language Usage.

3. What implementation challenges and barriers did the school encounter?

The biggest barriers seem to be with implementation of programs for our ELL students. Camden's Promise Charter School's ESOL Program is growing, and the program coordinator was committed to the program. The school finished their SIOP trainings

throughout the year to help the staff become more comfortable with this at-risk population. We were also able to add a parent ELL program in the afternoons, which is exciting.

Another challenge was keeping up with the demands for training on technology applications and resources. Camden's Promise is a LoTi Digital-Aged School, part of our funding was spent on Chrome books for the classroom. As a school it became challenging to keep up with training for staff to keep them ahead of the curve. This past year, a strong portion of professional development will be on technology training including google docs, Schoology, ixl.com, and measuring up live.

4. What were the apparent strengths and weaknesses of each step during the program(s) implementation?

The apparent strengths were the continued success of our mathematics program. For three years in a row, the school has made the performance target set by the state in all subgroup for mathematics, as per the 2013 -2014 performance report. On the other hand our Language Arts program has not fared as well. While there was growth in some areas, when studying the same cohort of students from 2013 to 2014 on the NJASK LAL, the school did not meet its academic performance targets based on the 2014 NJASK scores. While we do not have the latest PARCC scores for 2014 - 2015 school year, we are excited about the students' preparation for the test. Out of the 306 valid scores, only 75.2% passed the Mathematics 2014 NJASK. This past year (2013-2014) we did meet our target in all subgroups, which is very exciting. Out of the 306 valid scores, only 57.2% passed the LAL NJASK, which was in an increase from the year before by 4.3 percentage points.

5. How did the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the programs?

Our stakeholders did not need to be convinced on the merits of the programs offered this year. They were supportive of all programs and the need for them. Camden's Promise Charter School's goal is always to make the students' academic experience better and more productive. There is also good communication between the stakeholders and the Title I Coordinator, which makes implementation easier.

6. What were the perceptions of the staff? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the staff's perceptions?

The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior

were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative.

7. What were the perceptions of the community? What tool(s) did the school use to measure the community's perceptions?

Each family was given a survey either at the end of the year or when they came in for parent orientation. Camden's Promise received 279 completed surveys back from our families. 62% of parents surveyed, gave the school an "A" rating for the school year, 33% gave the school a "B", and 5% gave the school a "C". Three parents did not choose to respond to this question. The main positive aspects identified by the parents in the survey were:

- CPCS provides a safe environment for teaching and learning (99% parents agreed with this statement).
- CPCS has a good relationship with the community (85% of parents agreed).
- CPCS provides a positive experience for parents (94% of parents agreed).
- Volunteers are welcome at Camden's Promise (only 80% agreed, however 1 parent disagreed and the rest marked that they were unsure, 55 parents).
- I am satisfied with school bus transportation to and from school 75% agreed (8 parents disagreed with this statement and 61 don't' know).
- 8. What were the methods of delivery for each program (i.e. one-on-one, group session, etc.)?

Most of the programs delivered in 2014 – 2015 were group sessions or class instruction. The four main implementations this year were LoTi Literacy, LoTi Mathematics, Technology Use in the Classroom, and Math Reasoning. There were several components to the program included benchmarking students in both subject areas and more teacher observation and feedback from administrators to improve classroom instruction. Part of this program was also creating a LoTi Digital-Age School.

#### 9. How did the school structure the interventions?

Since Camden's Promise Charter School follows a school wide plan, many of these programs allowed all students to participate. The PARCC afterschool program conducted December – February of 2015 and the class size reduction targeted specific students, based on MAP scores.

#### 10. How frequently did students receive instructional interventions?

The LoTi program in both math and Language Arts, the Math Reasoning Class, and the ELL program took place throughout the whole year, while the afterschool and summer programs were only for specific time as described above.

#### 11. What technologies did the school use to support the program?

Over the past several years, Camden's Promise Charter School has been madding a considerable effort to increase the use of technology use within the classroom. This has been done in a wide variety of ways, including the installation of Epson Smart Notebooks and software onto many classrooms, adding an Apple mini cart for teacher checkout, 42 Chrome books for teacher checkout, Nexus Tablet cart for checkout, and four laptop carts for teacher checkout, all in grades 7th and 8th. In grades 5th and 6th, we were able to give each classroom a cart of Chrome books to use as a 1 to 1 for each student.

The school also has a tablet gifting program, which we have continued in the past year, for students who earn them in a wide range of ways, including straight A's, Student of the Year, NJASK Advance Proficient students from 2013 - 2014, National Junior Beta Club inductees, etc... The goal of the school is to have every student with a Chrome book by next year. The 6th-8th graders will check them out at the beginning of the school year and use it both at home and at school, while 5th graders will continue to use the classroom carts in school, so they can familiarize themselves with the device.

All that being said, the problem is keeping up with all of the latest advances each device has to offer. 28.33% of the teaching staff, when given a climate survey at the end of the past school year, listed Using Technology in the Classroom as the number one item they would like more professional development in for the upcoming school year. This continues to be our number one ranked area for the question, "In which of the following areas do you feel you need professional development in order to effectively teach your students?"

#### 12. Did the technology contribute to the success of the program and, if so, how?

The use of technology contributed to the success of our Mathematics program this year. Camden's Promise Charter School met all of its academic performance targets, based on the 2014 NJASK scores, including the Black, Hispanic, Special Education, and Economically

Disadvantaged subgroups. Specifically, the students' enjoyed the addition of Ixl.com and Measuring Up Live to their repertoire this year, in both mathematics and Language Arts. This program allows a teacher to assign specific standards and skills to individual students based on their need. The kids like the program because it is kid friendly, high energy, on their level.

<sup>\*</sup>Provide a separate response for each question.

#### **Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance**

#### State Assessments-Partially Proficient

Provide the number of students at each grade level listed below who scored partially proficient on state assessments for two years or more in English Language Arts and Mathematics, and the interventions the students received.

| English<br>Language Arts | 2013-<br>2014 | 2014-<br>2015                                     | Interventions Provided   | Describe why the interventions <u>did</u> or <u>did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|--------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|
| Grade 5                  | NA            | NA  |  |  |
| Grade 6                  | 44-LAL        | NA – No<br>Scores<br>Available<br>at this<br>time | Extended Day Program - Afterschool<br>Programs, Approved Professional<br>Development, 90 Minutes of instruction in<br>LAL per day, and LoTi Digital Age School | NA – No Scores Available at this time  |
| Grade 7                  | 34-LAL        | NA – No<br>Scores<br>Available<br>at this<br>time | Extended Day Program -Afterschool<br>Programs, Approved Professional<br>Development, 90 Minutes of instruction in<br>LAL per day, LoTi Digital Age School      | NA – No Scores Available at this time  |
| Grade 8                  | 25 LAL        | NA – No<br>Scores<br>Available<br>at this<br>time | Extended Day Program - Afterschool<br>Programs, Approved Professional<br>Development 90 Minutes of instruction in LAL<br>per day, LoTi Digital Age School      | NA – No Scores Available at this time  |

| Mathematics | 2013-<br>2014 | 2014-<br>2015                                     | Interventions Provided   | Describe why the interventions <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|-------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| Grade 5     | NA            | NA  |  |   |
| Grade 6     | 4 – Math      | NA – No<br>Scores<br>Available<br>at this<br>time | Extended Day Program – After School<br>Programs, Approved Professional<br>Development, Additional 45 Minutes of math<br>per day (Math Reasoning), LoTi Digital Age<br>School | NA – No Scores Available at this time   |
| Grade 7     | 10 –<br>Math  | NA – No<br>Scores<br>Available<br>at this<br>time | Extended Day Program - After School<br>Programs, Approved Professional<br>Development, Additional 45 Minutes of math<br>per day (Math Reasoning), LoTi Digital Age<br>School | NA – No Scores Available at this time   |
| Grade 8     | 47            |   | NA – No Scores Available at this time  |   |

# Evaluation of 2014-2015 Student Performance Non-Tested Grades – Alternative Assessments (Below Level)

Provide the number of students at each non-tested grade level listed below who performed below level on a standardized and/or developmentally appropriate assessment, and the interventions the students received.

| English Language<br>Arts | 2013 -<br>2014 | 2014 -<br>2015 | Interventions Provided | Describe why the interventions <u>did or did not</u> result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|---|
| Pre-Kindergarten         |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Kindergarten             |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 1                  |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 2                  |                |                | NA                     |   |

| Grade 9  |  | NA |  |
|----------|--|----|--|
| Grade 10 |  | NA |  |

| Mathematics      | 2013 -<br>2014 | 2014 -<br>2015 | Interventions Provided | Describe why the interventions provided <u>did</u> or <u>did</u> not result in proficiency (Be specific for each intervention). |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|---|
| Pre-Kindergarten |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Kindergarten     |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 1          |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 2          |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 9          |                |                | NA                     |   |
| Grade 10         |                |                | NA                     |   |

### **Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies**

#### <u>Interventions to Increase Student Achievement</u> – Implemented in 2014-2015

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group                 | 3<br>Intervention | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| ELA          | Students with Disabilities | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Students with Disabilities | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | Homeless                   | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Homeless                   | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | Migrant                    | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Migrant                    | NA                |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | ELLS                       | ESOL Program      | Yes                      | MAP Scores, Access Scores        | The school has initiated a very thorough process to identify ELL students. Measures which included various assessments (MAC II), parent surveys, and teacher recommendations were used to determine the language development needs of our students. In the spring of 2015, the Access for ELLs test was administered to all students either identified by Camden's Promise Charter School or recognized through NJSMART data as being in an ELL program in a sending school |
| Math         | ELLS                       | ESOL Program      | Yes                      | MAP Scores, Access Scores,       | The school has initiated a very thorough process to identify ELL students. Measures which included various assessments (MAC II), parent surveys, and teacher  |

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group                    | 3<br>Intervention                          | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5<br>Documentation of<br>Effectiveness                                     | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
|              |                               |  |                          |  | recommendations were used to determine the language development needs of our students. In the spring of 2015, the Access for ELLs test was administered to all students either identified by Camden's Promise Charter School or recognized through NJSMART data as being in an ELL program in a sending school |
| ELA          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA   |                          |  |  |
| Math         | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA   |                          |  |  |
| ELA          | All Students                  | Digital Age School =<br>Accelerated Reader | yes                      | Goals & achievement on books read. Grade achieved for each marking period. | Accelerated Reader worked for the following reasons:  1) Teachers and administrators were supportive of the initiative.  2) Students had relatively easy access to computers to complete AR assessments.  3) Students understood the requirements and were actively involved in meeting their individual goal. |
| Math         | All Students                  | LoTi – Turning Up the<br>Heat              | yes                      | Benchmark Test HEAT Walkthroughs Formal Evaluations                        | Pre- and Post - Benchmark test were given three times during the school year to all student in both Number Sense and Math Reasoning.  Also multiple HEAT Walkthroughs and formal observations were done to give feed back to   |

| 1<br>Content    | 2<br>Group        | 3<br>Intervention         | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness  | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
|                 |                   |                           | 700 100                  | 2000000   | the math department on this new strategy.   |
| Math            | Math All Students | Ixl.com Ye                | Yes                      | Performance Targets based<br>on NJASK scores, MAP test,<br>Math Benchmark tests (pre-<br>and post-) | Increased student comprehension of mathematics and for at-risk students. Since all students were working at their own levels and pacing, it made it is a usable tool to reteach and retest certain skills the students missed.            |
|                 |                   |                           |                          |   | There were positive gains from the pre- to the post-test and our students met the performance targets for mathematics.  |
| Math<br>and LAL | All Students      | Renaissance               | Yes                      | Student grades, Behavioral Record, & attendance record  | Student grades, attendance, and behavior improved from the previous year as measured by the amount and the color of the Renaissance Cards issued in 2014 - 2015.  |
|                 |                   |                           |                          |   | The idea behind Renaissance is that students "get it" when they don't "get it", meaning a student wants a card when they see all the fun activities and acknowledgements the students that do receive cards get.                          |
|                 |                   |                           |                          |   | The program has become embedded into the culture of the school, and this past year we incorporated more trips, for our top three cards.   |
| Math            | All Students      | Math Reasoning<br>Classes | Yes                      | Student Grades, Performance Targets for Math based on MAP scores                                    | The addition of this supplemental class to give the students an additional 45 minutes of mathematics was very helpful. All subgroups met their math academic performance targets based on the MAP Testing, grades 5th – 8 <sup>th</sup> . |

#### **Extended Day/Year Interventions** – Implemented in 2014-2015 to Address Academic Deficiencies

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group                    | 3<br>Intervention                                | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5<br>Documentation of<br>Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|--|
| ELA          | Students with Disabilities    | NA   |                          |  |  |
| Math         | Students with<br>Disabilities | NA   |                          |  |  |
| ELA          | Homeless                      | NA   |                          |  |  |
| Math         | Homeless                      | NA   |                          |  |  |
| ELA          | Migrant                       | NA   |                          |  |  |
| Math         | Migrant                       | NA   |                          |  |  |
| ELA          | ELLs                          | After School<br>Homework Help<br>Program for ELL | Yes                      | Attendance Sheets,<br>Students Grades  | Access Scores – 10 out of 13 students showed gains on their overall scores, MAP test   |
| Math         | ELLs                          | After School<br>Homework Help<br>Program for ELL | Yes                      | Attendance Sheets,<br>Students Grades  | Access Scores – 10 out of 13 students showed gains on their overall scores, MAP test   |
| ELA          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA   |                          |  |  |
| Math         | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA   |                          |  |  |
| ELA/<br>Math | All Students                  | PARCC After School<br>Program                    | Yes                      | PARCC Scores, MAP scores               | MAP test Scores, Attendance At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every |

| 1            | 2            | 3                                  | 4         | 5                        | 6   |
|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---|
| Content      | Group        | Intervention                       | Effective | Documentation of         | Measurable Outcomes   |
|              |              | miter ventuon                      | Yes-No    | Effectiveness            | (Outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|              |              |                                    |           |                          | student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage. |
| Math/<br>ELA | All Students | Promise Summer<br>Learning Program | Yes       | PARCC Scores, MAP Scores | MAP test Scores, Attendance At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas   |

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group | 3<br>Intervention | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5<br>Documentation of<br>Effectiveness | 6<br>Measurable Outcomes<br>(Outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|--------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
|              |            |                   |                          |  | exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage. |

### **Evaluation of 2014-2015 Interventions and Strategies**

<u>Professional Development</u> – Implemented in 2014-2015

| 1       | 2                             | 3   | 4         | 5   | 6  |
|---------|-------------------------------|---|-----------|---|--|
| Content | Group                         |   | Effective | Documentation of                          | Measurable Outcomes  |
| Content | Group                         | Intervention  | Yes-No    | Effectiveness                             | (Outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
| ELA     | Students with Disabilities    | NA  |           |   | (**************************************  |
| Math    | Students with<br>Disabilities | NA  |           |   |  |
| ELA     | Homeless                      | NA  |           |   |  |
| Math    | Homeless                      | NA  |           |   |  |
| ELA     | Migrant                       | NA  |           |   |  |
| Math    | Migrant                       | NA  |           |   |  |
| ELA     | ELLs                          | NA  |           |   |  |
| Math    | ELLs                          | NA  |           |   |  |
| ELA     | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA  |           |   |  |
| Math    | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA  |           |   |  |
| ELA     | All Students                  | Improving Language<br>Arts Literacy in the<br>Classroom – Sarah<br>Tantillo | Yes       | PD Attendance, MAP scores<br>PARCC Scores | At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, |

| 1               | 2            | 3  | 4         | 5   | 6   |
|-----------------|--------------|--|-----------|---|---|
| Content         | Group        | Intervention                               | Effective | Documentation of                          | Measurable Outcomes   |
|                 |              | intervention                               | Yes-No    | Effectiveness                             | (Outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|                 |              |  |           |   | by the May 2015 test In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage.  |
| Math<br>and ELA | All Students | LoTi Digital Aged Learning in Math and ELA | Yes       | PD Attendance, MAP scores<br>PARCC Scores | The staff as whole is always the greatest strength. They can make any program successful by their hard work and determination. This year the Loti Mathematics Programs implementation was nearly flawless. This was the third year of the program so the students and staff were comfortable with it and utilized it wisely. At Camden's Promise Charter School our Mathematics scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test In |

| 1       | 2     | 3            | 4         | 5                | 6 Measurable Outcomes   |
|---------|-------|--------------|-----------|------------------|---|
| Content | Group | Intervention | Effective | Documentation of |   |
|         |       |              | Yes-No    | Effectiveness    | the 6th grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 17% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, in all three subject areas we exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, only 14% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in both Mathematics and Language Usage. |

#### <u>Family and Community Engagement</u> Implemented in 2014-2015

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group                 | 3<br>Intervention | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5<br>Documentation of<br>Effectiveness | 6<br>Measurable Outcomes<br>(Outcomes must be quantifiable) |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| ELA          | Students with Disabilities | NA                |                          |  |   |

| 1<br>Content | 2<br>Group                    | 3<br>Intervention     | 4<br>Effective<br>Yes-No | 5 Documentation of Effectiveness | 6 Measurable Outcomes (Outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Math         | Students with<br>Disabilities | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | Homeless                      | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Homeless                      | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | Migrant                       | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Migrant                       | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | ELLs                          | ELL Class for Parents | yes                      | Attendance                       | Attendance. While we had a small number of parents attend, we feel it was a start in the right direction. Hopefully through word of mouth it will grow this year. |
| Math         | ELLs                          | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| ELA          |                               | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |
| Math         |                               | NA                    |                          |                                  |   |

#### **Principal's Certification**

| The following certification must be completed by the principal of the school. Please Note: Signatures must be kept on file at the school. A copy of the Evaluation form, with all appropriate signatures, must be included as part of the submission of the Schoolwide Plan. |   |      |  |  |
|--|---|------|--|--|
| •  | vide committee conducted and completed the required Title I school this evaluation, I concur with the information herein, including the | •    |  |  |
|  |   |      |  |  |
| Principal's Name (Print)   | Princinal's Signature   | Date |  |  |

ESEA §1114(b)(1)(A): "A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school [including taking into account the needs of migratory children as defined in §1309(2)] that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards described in §1111(b)(1)."

# 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Data Collection and Analysis

Multiple Measures Analyzed by the School in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process for 2015-2016

| Areas                          | Multiple Measures Analyzed                                    | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Academic Achievement – Reading | MAP, Benchmark Assessment Measures, Parent and Teacher Survey | The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative.  At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test In the |

| Areas                          | Multiple Measures Analyzed  | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes   |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
|                                |   | (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)  6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage.   |
| Academic Achievement - Writing | MAP Test Teacher and Parent<br>Survey, Benchmark Assessment<br>Measures | The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative.  At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in |

| Areas                              | Multiple Measures Analyzed  | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
|                                    |   | Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage.   |
| Academic Achievement - Mathematics | MAP Tests, Teacher and Parent<br>Survey, Benchmark Assessment<br>Measures | The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative.  The staff as whole is always the greatest strength. They can make any program successful by their hard work and determination. This year the Loti Mathematics Programs implementation was nearly flawless. This was the third year of the program so the students and staff were comfortable with it and utilized it wisely. At Camden's Promise Charter School our Mathematics |

| Areas                           | Multiple Measures Analyzed   | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
|                                 |  | scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6th grade, 22% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 17% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, in all three subject areas we exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, only 14% of the students were more than 1 year behind in Mathematics by the end of the year, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in both Mathematics and Language Usage. |
| Family and Community Engagement | Parent Attendance at Back to<br>School Night, Parent Orientation,<br>Report Card Conferences,<br>Parenting Class Attendance,<br>Parent Surveys | Each family was given a survey either at the end of the year or when they came in for parent orientation. Camden's Promise received 279 completed surveys back from our families. 62% of parents surveyed, gave the school an "A" rating for the school year, 33% gave the school a "B", and 5% gave the school a "C". Three parents did not choose to respond to this question. The main positive aspects identified by the parents in the survey were:  CPCS provides a safe environment for teaching and learning (99% parents agreed with this statement).  CPCS has a good relationship with the community (85% of parents agreed).  CPCS provides a positive experience for parents (94% of parents agreed).  Volunteers are welcome at Camden's Promise (only 80% agreed,   |

| Areas                    | Multiple Measures Analyzed  | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|--------------------------|---|---|
|                          |   | however 1 parent disagreed and the rest marked that they were unsure, 55 parents).  • I am satisfied with school bus transportation to and from school – 75% agreed (8 parents disagreed with this statement and 61 don't' know).   |
| Professional Development | State Assessments, Teacher Survey, MAP, Attendance of staff at the Summer Institute and other PD events throughout the year | At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage.  Also 100% staff attends all PD that they are assigned, unless they are absent from school.  |
| Leadership               | Climate Survey and Post<br>Observation Conferences  | The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked |

| Areas                      | Multiple Measures Analyzed       | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)   |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
|                            |                                  | Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative.   |
| School Climate and Culture | Parent Survey and Teacher Survey | The staff is involved in the needs assessment process and valued for their feedback and suggestions. This year the staff also participated in a climate survey to get some anonymous feedback on a wide range of subjects. Some noteworthy data included the following: 64.5% of the staff felt the school administration spent sufficient time focusing on being instructional leaders of the school. Getting students to expected levels of performance, diverse student learning needs in the classroom, and student behavior were the three main factors that contributed to the teachers work load on 2014 – 2015. Finally, 66.13% of staff felt the teachers had sufficient training and support to fully utilize available instructional technology. This researcher also found unlike last year where 15% of the staff felt they did not receive feedback that could help them improve their teaching, only 12% of the staff felt this way at the end of the 2015 year. Also, 28.3% of the staff ranked Using Technology in the Classroom as the number 1 thing they need more PD in for next year. This was the highest percentage followed by Language Arts Literacy Strategies, which scored 23.33%. All in all, the information was incredibly revealing and informative. |
|                            |                                  | Each family was given a survey either at the end of the year or when they came in for parent orientation. Camden's Promise received 279 completed surveys back from our families. 62% of parents surveyed, gave the school an "A" rating for the school year, 33% gave the school a "B", and 5% gave the school a "C". Three parents did not choose to respond to this question. The main positive aspects identified by the parents in the survey were:  CPCS provides a safe environment for teaching and learning (99% parents agreed with this statement).  CPCS has a good relationship with the community (85% of parents   |

| Areas                       | Multiple Measures Analyzed                      | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
|                             |   | (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|                             |   | <ul> <li>agreed).</li> <li>CPCS provides a positive experience for parents (94% of parents agreed).</li> <li>Volunteers are welcome at Camden's Promise (only 80% agreed, however 1 parent disagreed and the rest marked that they were unsure, 55 parents).</li> <li>I am satisfied with school bus transportation to and from school – 75% agreed (8 parents disagreed with this statement and 61 don't' know).</li> </ul>   |
| School-Based Youth Services | NA  |  |
| Students with Disabilities  | NJ School Performance Targets –<br>LAL and Math | When comparing performance targets in this subgroup form 2011 – 2012 to 2012 – 2013, there was a significant decrease in LAL from 29% passing in 2012 to only 7% in 2013. This can be contributed to three students moving from taking the APA to trying the NJASK unsuccessfully. Since the population is so small, just 43 students, these three scores had a significant effect. When comparing performance targets in mathematics for this subgroup for the two years, there was an increase in from 31.6% passing in 2012 to 41.8% in 2013. This can be attributed to the Math Reasoning Class and the LoTi program. On the 2013 -2014 NJASK, the student in this category met their target in Math, under the confidence interval, but not in LAL. |
| Homeless Students           | NA  |  |
| Migrant Students            | NA  |  |
| English Language Learners   | Access for ELLs                                 | The school has initiated a very thorough process to identify ELL students. Measures which included various assessments, parent surveys, and teacher recommendations were used to determine the language development needs of our students. In the spring of 2015, the <i>Access for ELLs</i> test was administered to all students either identified by Camden's Promise Charter School or recognized through NJSMART data as being in an ELL program in a sending school. When comparing 2014 to 2015 ACCESS scores for our current 6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> graders, 10 out of 13 showed growth from the previous  |

| Areas                      | Multiple Measures Analyzed                      | Overall Measurable Results and Outcomes (Results and outcomes must be quantifiable)  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
|                            |   | school year.   |
| Economically Disadvantaged | NJ School Performance Targets –<br>LAL and Math | When comparing performance targets in this subgroup form $2011 - 2012$ to $2012 - 2013$ , there was a significant decrease in LAL from 57.1% passing in 2012 to only 53% in 2013. This can be contributed to the addition of the 2012 5 <sup>th</sup> graders scores, now 6 <sup>th</sup> graders. In 5 <sup>th</sup> grade, their scores did not average due to time in district being less than one year, but their percent passing was only 35.1%. In 2012 – 2013 their scores do count and while improvement was shown, only 44% of the subgroup was proficient.   |
|                            |   | When comparing performance targets in mathematics for this subgroup for the two years, there was an increase in from 73.3% passing in 2012 to 79.9% in 2013. This can be attributed to the Math Reasoning Class and the LoTi program.  |
|                            |   | The 2013 -2014 scores show continued success of our mathematics program. For three years in a row, the school has made the performance target set by the state in all subgroup for mathematics, as per the 2013 - 2014 performance report. On the other hand our Language Arts program has not fared as well. While there was growth in some areas, when studying the same cohort of students from 2013 to 2014 on the NJASK LAL, the school did not meet its academic performance targets based on the 2014 NJASK scores. While we do not have the latest PARCC scores for 2014 - 2015 school year, we are excited about the students' preparation for the test. Out of the 306 valid scores, only 75.2% passed the Mathematics 2014 NJASK. This past year (2013-2014) we did meet our target in all subgroups, which is very exciting. Out of the 306 valid scores, only 57.2% passed the LAL NJASK, which was in an increase from the year before by 4.3 percentage points. |

# 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process\* Narrative

1. What process did the school use to conduct its Comprehensive Needs Assessment?

Through the 2014 – 2015 school year parents were assembled at two separate meetings during the summer to discuss concerns for the school and their student's, the parents were also given a survey during the school at the end of the 2014 – 2015 school year. The staff was given a survey as well, in April of 2015. Over the 2015 spring, the vice principal, department heads, teachers, and Team Leaders were assembled to discuss the needs of Camden's Promise Charter School further. The committees looked at BAM scores, student grades, parent and teacher concerns through the survey, and Terra Nova scores. Once this list of needs was compiled, it was presented to Dr. Conway for review and final selection.

2. What process did the school use to collect and compile data for student subgroups?

The principal, testing coordinator, team leaders, and department heads met to disaggregate data compiled from Terra Nova and other assessment measures. Their findings were compiled and shared with the other teachers in a professional development workshop.

**3.** How does the school ensure that the data used in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process are valid (measures what it is designed to measure) and reliable (yields consistent results)?

All state testing is aligned to the Common Core Standards and the district curriculum. The MAP testing is norm-referenced nationally. The other data collected is based on teacher surveys which were conducted and disaggregated by the State of New Jersey, parent surveys, or simple data collecting techniques such as student attendance in a program. The data compiled is not subjective in nature and therefore is valid and reliable.

4. What did the data analysis reveal regarding classroom instruction?

Additional training and guidance was needed in both writing and reading across grades 5th through 8th. Also, teachers continue to need support in utilizing technology in their classroom as an instructional tool. The significant gains in Mathematics on the 2013

NJASK were directly related to this new model of double math periods and LoTi benchmarking. While this program is working, the school has not hit the 90% Performance Target, the state has required. Hopefully the 2014 scores will reflect this mile stone.

- **5.** What did the data analysis reveal regarding professional development implemented in the previous year(s)?
  - The staff participated in all training including a two week professional development in August 2013 focused on increasing NJASK scores in both Language Arts and Mathematics. All professional development in the 2013 2014 school year was designed to empower the teacher within the classroom. This was accomplished by providing a better understanding of how to utilize assessment data within the classroom and also by providing training on tools to aid student learning with in the classroom. These trainings included but are not limited to Loti Digital Age School for LAL and Math, Revisiting Common Core Standards and How to better use them to guide instruction, SIOP training, Sarah Tantillo The Literacy Cookbook, and utilizing technology. All of this professional development led to student growth however not as successfully in LAL as in mathematics. Several PD's were so successful such as Sarah Tantillo, and LoTi the teachers have asked for continuing education in these areas during the 2015 2016 school year.
- 6. How does the school identify educationally at-risk students in a timely manner?
  - At-risk students are identified by data analysis of standardized test, teacher recommendation, and student performance. This review is held weekly at team meetings and students are then brought up in an I&RS Committee meeting for review. An I&RS Committee regularly meets to determine the need for intervention and referral to the Child Study Team on child referred.
- 7. How does the school provide effective interventions to educationally at-risk students?
  - Data assessments are disaggregated by the classroom teacher (SUBJECT AREA) to differentiate instruction. In-class support teachers are provided for even greater assistance in those classrooms identified as having at-risk students. Also, the I&RS committee meets with the parents of at-risk students to set up a plan, and educational modifications, including mentors, are created as necessary. Finally, this past year the school offered small class instruction in both LAL and mathematics for at-risk students.

- 8. How does the school address the needs of migrant students? NA
- **9.** How does the school address the needs of homeless students?
  - We refer homeless students to the McKinney-Vento Services, which is coordinated by the Gloucester County Special Services District. The supplemental services include: tutoring, school supplies, advocacy, counseling, supplemental transportation, health services, and parent activities.
- **10.** How does the school engage its teachers in decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to provide information on and improve the instructional program?
  - The teachers were considered the front line of the process for disaggregating NJASK scores as well as MAP scores as stated earlier. While the same process is also done by the Curriculum Coordinator for accuracy, the shared information leads discussions and curricular changes in all departments.
- **11.** How does the school help students transition from preschool to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle to high school?
  - The incoming 5th graders participate in a 1 week, 4 ½ hours each day, orientation in the summer. During this week students are acclimated to the new policies and procedures as well as just becoming accustomed to the floor plan of the school. Students also participate in MAP testing at this time so that the school has base line data to monitor growth. This makes their transition in the fall to CPCS less stressful.
- **12.** How did the school select the priority problems and root causes for the 2015-2016 schoolwide plan?
  - After reviewing all the data collected in the needs assessment portion of this process, the school decided that the 2014 -2015 priority problems and root causes will be continued through the 2015 2016 school year.\**Provide a separate response for each question.*

# 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them

Based upon the school's needs assessment, select at least three (3) priority problems that will be addressed in this plan. Complete the information below for each priority problem.

|   | #1   | #2   |
|---|--|--|
| Name of priority problem                                      | Turning Up the H.E.A.T. (i.e., Higher order thinking,<br>Engaged learning, Authentic connections, Technology<br>use) in our English Language Arts, History, and Science<br>Classrooms  | Turning Up the H.E.A.T. (i.e., Higher order thinking,<br>Engaged learning, Authentic connections, Technology<br>use) in our Math Classrooms  |
| Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources | Camden's Promise Charter School will continue to transition into a LoTi (Level of Teaching Innovation) Digital –Age School during the 2015 – 2016 school year. A LoTi Digital–Age School is a research-based program that focuses on the delicate balance between instruction, assessment, and the effective use of the available digital tools and resources to increase the amount of H.E.A.T. as described above and to improve student academic progress over a three staged process. Teachers need specialized professional development enabling them to utilize technology in their classroom more freely which adds critical thinking, authentic connections, and increased student engagement to the lesson. The staff will be trained regarding H.E.A.T. walkthroughs and formal evaluations which is a teacher assessment tool used by the administration. | Camden's Promise Charter School will continue to transition into a LoTi (Level of Teaching Innovation) Digital –Age School during the 2015 – 2016 school year. A LoTi Digital–Age School is a research-based program that focuses on the delicate balance between instruction, assessment, and the effective use of the available digital tools and resources to increase the amount of H.E.A.T. as described above and to improve student academic progress over a three staged process. Teachers need specialized professional development enabling them to utilize technology in their classroom more freely which adds critical thinking, authentic connections, and increased student engagement to the lesson. The staff will be trained regarding H.E.A.T. walkthroughs and formal evaluations which is a teacher assessment tool used by the administration. |
| Describe the root causes of the problem                       | Teachers lack sufficient knowledge of appropriate strategies to integrate technology into instruction, in addition to inconsistent feedback procedures through the classroom observation process. Also, more technology needs to be added for both the teachers and  | Teachers lack sufficient knowledge of appropriate strategies to integrate technology into instruction, in addition to inconsistent feedback procedures through the classroom observation process. Also, more technology needs to be added for both the teachers and  |

|   | students to benefit from the CPCS becoming a Loti<br>Digital Age school.  | students to benefit from the CPCS becoming a Loti<br>Digital Age school.  |
|---|---|---|
| Subgroups or populations addressed  | Total Population, Economically Disadvantage, Hispanic and African-American population, ELL, Special Ed, and Teacher Population  | Total Population, Economically Disadvantage, Hispanic and African-American population, ELL, Special Ed., and Teacher Population   |
| Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)                            | LAL   | Mathematics   |
| Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems | Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. | Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. |
| How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?           | LoTi specifically aligns to the Common Core Literacy Standards by turning up the HEAT - Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. It also prepares students for the rigors of college and career readiness.  | LoTi specifically aligns to the Common Core Mathematics Standards by turning up the HEAT - Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. It also prepares students for the rigors of college and career readiness. LoTi also prides itself on its explorations in Mathematics, which directly align to the Common Core Mathematical Practices.   |

# 2015-2016 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Description of Priority Problems and Interventions to Address Them (continued)

|   | #3   | #4 |
|---|--|----|
| Name of priority problem                                      | Professional Development to meet the Needs of At-risk Learners   |    |
| Describe the priority problem using at least two data sources | At Camden's Promise Charter School scores as determined by the MAP test are still not where we want them to be, which is every student is performing less than 1 year behind. The students were given the test in July of 2014, December of 2014 and May of 2015. In the 5th grade, 27% were behind in Language Usage, and 22% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 6th grade, 31% were behind in Language Usage, and 38% again in Reading, by the May 2015 test. In the 7th grade, 28 % were behind in Language Usage, and 34% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. For 7th grade, both areas exceeded the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT. Finally, in the 8th grade, 40% were behind in Language Usage, and 39% in Reading, by the May 2015 test. The 8th grade did however, beet the Norm Grade Level Mean RIT in Language Usage.  When looking at the NJ School Performance Report, the school met all of its target for mathematics, but none |    |
| Describe the root causes of the problem                       | for LAL, as described by the NJASK 2014.  The root cause of this problem is a lack of professional development in educating the at-risk factor groups listed above. Specifically teachers lack sufficient knowledge of appropriate strategies to address the diverse needs of all students in content areas.  Also, the teachers lack sufficient knowledge of  |    |

|   | appropriate strategies to address the use of technology in the classroom. In addition, while teachers did report receiving better feedback in 2014-2015 on instructional practice, CPCS needs to continue to grow in this area.  Total Population, Economically Disadvantage, Hispanic  |  |
|---|---|--|
| Subgroups or populations addressed  | and African-American population, ELL, Special Ed, and Teacher Population  |  |
| Related content area missed (i.e., ELA, Mathematics)                            | LAL   |  |
| Name of scientifically research based intervention to address priority problems | Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. |  |
| How does the intervention align with the Common Core State Standards?           | LoTi specifically aligns to the Common Core Literacy<br>Standards by turning up the HEAT - Higher order<br>thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and<br>high quality Technology use in the learning process. It<br>also prepares students for the rigors of college and<br>career readiness.   |  |

ESEA §1114(b) Components of a Schoolwide Program: A schoolwide program shall include . . . schoolwide reform strategies that . . . "

#### 2015-2016 Interventions to Address Student Achievement

|                       | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school; |                                 |                       |   |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention            | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |  |
| ELA                   | Students with Disabilities  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| Math                  | Students with Disabilities  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| ELA                   | Homeless  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| Math                  | Homeless  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| ELA                   | Migrant   | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| Math                  | Migrant   | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| ELA                   | ELLs  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| Math                  | ELLs  | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| ELA                   | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| Math                  | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | NA                              |                       |   |   |  |
| ELA                   | All Students  | LoTi Literacy<br>Implementation | Vice<br>principal     | Literacy Checkpoint Assessments throughout the 2015 – 2016 school year.  Teacher Observations and classroom walkthroughs , done electronically and stored at LoTi | Research shows that LoTi Digital-<br>Age Schools improve student<br>academic achievement while<br>building effective and efficient<br>digital-age learning communities.<br>LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to<br>align instructional initiatives (e.g. |  |

|                       | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school; |   |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention  | Person<br>Responsible                    | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)   | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)  |  |
|                       |   |   |  | website, showing a significant Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2016.  Will compare the total percent of students less than a year behind in LAL as reported on the MAP test from July 2015 to May 2016.   | Daggett's Rigor and Relevance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process.   |  |
| Math                  | All Students  | LoTi Math<br>Implementation   | Vice<br>Principal                        | LoTi Math Benchmark Assessments: Pre/Post Math BAMS throughout the 2015 – 2016 school year.  Teacher Observations and classroom walkthroughs done electronically and stored at LoTi website, showing a significant Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2016.  Will compare the total percent of students less than a year behind in math as reported on the MAP testing from July 2015 to May 2016, in grades 5 <sup>th</sup> – 7 <sup>th</sup> . | Research shows that LoTi Digital- Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. |  |
| Math                  | All Students  | Math Reasoning Supplemental Class, plus an additional teacher to reduce | Vice<br>Principal,<br>Math<br>Department | Will compare the total percent of students less than a year behind in math as reported on the MAP test from July 2015 to May 2016,   | Additional instruction time will lead to greater achievement. According to "Dispelling the Myth: High Poverty School Exceeding   |  |

|                       |                         | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) <u>st</u>                                    | rengthen the co               | ore academic program in the school;                          |   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s) | Name of Intervention   | Person<br>Responsible         | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes) | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |
|                       |                         | class size in grades 6 <sup>th</sup> – 8 <sup>th</sup> for math. | Head                          | in grades 5 <sup>th</sup> – 7 <sup>th</sup> .                | Expectations, a 1998 study by the Educational Trust, increasing instructional time in mathematics helped students to meet standards. This second year program supports the already existing math class by reinforcing fundamentals of math and reasoning skills in a hands-on lab environment. The class incorporates the Loti concepts of bringing the HEAT (Higher Order Thinking, Engaging the Student, Authentic Connection, and Technology Use). The implementation of this program resulted in the school meeting its performance target as described by 2012 school profile. CAPA reviewed this program, during the 2011 – 2012 school year and strongly encourage the continuance of Math Reasoning through NCLB funding. |
| LAL                   | All Students            | Accelerated Reader   | Reading<br>Department<br>Head | Progress on Accelerated Reader<br>Goals.                     | One study of Accelerated Reader™ that falls within the scope of the Adolescent Literacy review protocol meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards, and one study meets WWC evidence standards with reservations. The two studies included 2,877 students  |

|                       | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school; |                      |                       |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)  |  |
|                       |   |                      |                       |   | from grade 4 to grade 8 who attended elementary and middle schools in Oregon and Texas. Based on these two studies, the WWC considers the extent of evidence for Accelerated Reader™ on adolescent learners to be small for reading fluency and medium to large for comprehension. No studies that meet WWC evidence standards with or without reservations examined the effectiveness of Accelerated Reader™ on adolescent learners in the general literacy achievement domain.                       |  |
| Math and<br>LAL       | All Students  | lxl.com              | Vice<br>Principal     | Student Achievement on ixl.com modules and improved score on MAP testing when comparing July 2015 to May 2016 | Ixl.com is a versatile Web-based standards mastery program built to each state's standards. It functions as a diagnostic and progress monitoring tool as well as an instructional practice delivery platform. Ixl.com combines rigorous academic and dynamic content with skill-based questions to create a unique program that fosters learning instead of memorization. Going beyond traditional Workbook style skill practice, ixl.com offers a customized, self-paced, and student-friendly format |  |

|                       | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school; |  |                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention   | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)   | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |  |
| ELA and<br>Math       | All Students  | LoTi Digital-Age School – to support "Turning Up the HEAT", Measuring Up Live, Accelerated Reader, Ixl.com, Basic Extended day and year programs technology will be purchased for classroom use. | Vice<br>Principal     | Teacher Observations and classroom walkthroughs done electronically and stored at LoTi website, showing a significant Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2016.  Teacher Daily Lesson Plans | that engages and motivates students to succeed. This adaptability of the program can promote high rates of usage both in and out of the classroom. Together, these key features, based on solid scientific research (Watts, 2008), contribute to the strength of the program. During program implementation, educators can use this program with individual students at their prescribed instructional level, as supplemental practice with small groups of students, or as a whole class approach. Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high |  |

|                       | ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) strengthen the core academic program in the school; |                      |                         |   |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention | Person<br>Responsible   | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)  |  |  |
| LALand                | All Students  |                      | Danaissansa             | Student grades Debouieral   | quality Technology use in the learning process.  The idea behind Renaissance is that   |  |  |
| LAL and<br>Math       | All Students  | Renaissance          | Renaissance Coordinator | Student grades, Behavioral Record, & attendance record – Real Time runs a report which list the students that received a card | students "get it" when they don't "get it", meaning a student wants a card when they see all the fun activities and acknowledgements the students that do receive cards get.  Jostens Renaissance® is an acclaimed educational enrichment program that is customized by you and your school community. Jostens Renaissance® empowers you and your school to make it matter by boosting GPAs, increasing attendance, improving school pride and growing graduation rates. |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

#### 2015-2016 Extended Learning Time and Extended Day/Year Interventions to Address Student Achievement

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)    | Name of Intervention | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes) | Research Supporting Intervention<br>(i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works<br>Clearinghouse) |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| ELA                   | Students with Disabilities | NA                   |                       |  |   |

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and</u> summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target Population(s)          | Name of Intervention        | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)                       | Research Supporting Intervention (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| Math                  | Students with<br>Disabilities | NA                          |                       |  |   |
| ELA                   | Homeless                      | NA                          |                       |  |   |
| Math                  | Homeless                      | NA                          |                       |  |   |
| ELA                   | Migrant                       | NA                          |                       |  |   |
| Math                  | Migrant                       | NA                          |                       |  |   |
| ELA and<br>Math       | ELLs                          | HW Help for ELL<br>Students | ELL<br>Coordinator    | Students' work production and grades on assessments (teacher made, MAP, etc) | Additional instruction time will lead to greater achievement. According to "Dispelling the Myth: High Poverty School Exceeding Expectations, a 1998 study by the Educational Trust, increasing instructional time in mathematics helped students to meet standards. |
| Math and<br>ELA       | ELLs                          | Promise Summer<br>Learning  | ELL<br>Coordinator    | Students' work production and grades on assessments (teacher made, MAP, etc) | Additional instruction time will lead to greater achievement. According to "Dispelling the Myth: High Poverty School Exceeding Expectations, a 1998 study by the Educational Trust, increasing instructional time in mathematics helped students to meet standards. |
| ELA                   | Economically<br>Disadvantaged | NA                          |                       |  |   |

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and</u> summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

| <u>summer prog</u>    | summer programs and opportunities, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum; |  |  |  |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Intervention   | Person<br>Responsible                            | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)   | Research Supporting Intervention<br>(i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works<br>Clearinghouse)   |  |  |
| Math                  | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | NA   |  |  |   |  |  |
| ELA and<br>Math       | All Students  | LoTi Digital-Age School – to support "Turning Up the HEAT", Measuring Up Live, Accelerated Reader, Ixl.com, Basic Extended day and year programs technology will be purchased for classroom use. | Vice<br>Principal                                | Teacher Observations and classroom walkthroughs done electronically and stored at LoTi website, showing a 30% Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2014.  Teacher Daily Lesson PLans   | Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. |  |  |
| Math and<br>ELA       | All Students  | PARCC Afterschool<br>Program   | Vice<br>Principal,<br>Afterschool<br>Coordinator | Students who scored more than 1 year behind in either LAL or math on the MAP test, are asked to stay twice a week after school to build skills that might have been missed, for 10 weeks in the winter. The Measuring Up Live Programs is used to facilitate growth and guide students individually, on skill sets are | Additional instruction time will lead to greater achievement. According to "Dispelling the Myth: High Poverty School Exceeding Expectations, a 1998 study by the Educational Trust, increasing instructional time in mathematics helped students to meet standards.   |  |  |

ESEA §1114(b)(I)(B) increase the amount and quality of learning time, such as providing an <u>extended school year and before- and after-school and summer programs and opportunities</u>, and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum;

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s) | Name of Intervention               | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)   | Research Supporting Intervention<br>(i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works<br>Clearinghouse)   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
|                       |                         |                                    |                       | lacking.   |   |
| Math and<br>ELA       | All Students            | Promise Summer<br>Learning Program | Vice<br>Principal     | Students who scores more than 1 year behind on either the LAL or math MAP test are asked to do a 4 week program in the summer to continue to work on enhancing skill sets that might be lacking. | Additional instruction time will lead to greater achievement. According to "Dispelling the Myth: High Poverty School Exceeding Expectations, a 1998 study by the Educational Trust, increasing instructional time in mathematics helped students to meet standards. |

<sup>\*</sup>Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

#### 2015-2016 Professional Development to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Strategy                | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)   | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)  |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| ELA                   | Students with Disabilities  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| Math                  | Students with Disabilities  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| ELA                   | Homeless  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| Math                  | Homeless  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| ELA                   | Migrant   | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| Math                  | Migrant   | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| ELA                   | ELLs  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| Math                  | ELLs  | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| ELA                   | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| Math                  | Economically<br>Disadvantaged   | NA                              |                       |  |  |
| ELA                   | All Teachers who<br>teach LAL in their<br>classroom, which for<br>CPCS is all classes | LoTi Literacy<br>Implementation | Vice<br>principal     | Literacy Checkpoint Assessments throughout the 2015 – 2016 school year.  Teacher Observations and classroom walkthroughs showing | Research shows that LoTi Digital-<br>Age Schools improve student<br>academic achievement while<br>building effective and efficient<br>digital-age learning communities.<br>LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to |

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s)   | Name of Strategy            | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Strategy<br>(i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works<br>Clearinghouse)  |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| Math                  | All Teachers who<br>teach LAL in their<br>classroom, which for<br>CPCS is all classes | LoTi Math<br>Implementation | Vice<br>Principal     | a significant Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2016.  Will compare the total percent of students less than a year behind in LAL as reported on the MAP test.  LoTi Math Benchmark Assessments: Pre/Post Math BAMS throughout the 2015 – 2016 school year. Teacher observations and classroom walkthroughs showing a significant Increase in H.E.A.T. by June 2016.  Will compare the total percent of students less than a year behind in math as reported on the MAP test. | align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process.  Research shows that LoTi Digital-Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities.  LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the learning process. |
| Math and              | All Teachers/   | NJ LoTi Teacher             | Dr. Conway            | One 3 hour blended INTASC   | Research shows that LoTi Digital-  |

ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(D) In accordance with section 1119 and subsection (a)(4), high-quality and <u>ongoing professional development</u> for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

| Content<br>Area Focus | Target<br>Population(s) | Name of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)                                     | Research Supporting Strategy<br>(i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works<br>Clearinghouse)  |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| LAL                   | Administrators          | Evaluation System aligned to the INTASC Standards done by administrators online using tablets |                       | Certification Courses for Teachers and Administrators Teacher Observations and HEAT Walkthroughs | Age Schools improve student academic achievement while building effective and efficient digital-age learning communities. LoTi Digital-Age Schools also seek to align instructional initiatives (e.g. Daggett's Rigor and Relavance, Marzano's Researched-based Best Practices, Webbs' Depth of Knowledge) into one cohesive program to increase the amount of student H.E.A.T. – Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authentic connections, and high quality Technology use in the |
|                       |                         |   |                       |  | quality Technology use in the learning process.  |

<sup>\*</sup>Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

24 CFR § 200.26(c): Core Elements of a Schoolwide Program (Evaluation). A school operating a schoolwide program must—(1) Annually evaluate the implementation of, and results achieved by, the schoolwide program, using data from the State's annual assessments and other indicators of academic achievement; (2) Determine whether the schoolwide program has been effective in increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students who had been furthest from achieving the standards; and (3) Revise the plan, as necessary, based on the results of the evaluation, to ensure continuous improvement of students in the schoolwide program.

#### **Evaluation of Schoolwide Program\***

(For schools approved to operate a schoolwide program beginning in the 2015-2016 school year)

All Title I schoolwide programs must conduct an annual evaluation to determine if the strategies in the schoolwide plan are achieving the planned outcomes and contributing to student achievement. Schools must evaluate the implementation of their schoolwide program and the outcomes of their schoolwide program.

- 1. Who will be responsible for evaluating the schoolwide program for 2015-2016? Will the review be conducted internally (by school staff), or externally? How frequently will evaluation take place?
- 2. What barriers or challenges does the school anticipate during the implementation process?
- 3. How will the school obtain the necessary buy-in from all stakeholders to implement the program(s)?
- 4. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the staff?
- 5. What measurement tool(s) will the school use to gauge the perceptions of the community?
- 6. How will the school structure interventions?
- 7. How frequently will students receive instructional interventions?
- 8. What resources/technologies will the school use to support the schoolwide program?
- 9. What quantitative data will the school use to measure the effectiveness of each intervention provided?
- 10. How will the school disseminate the results of the schoolwide program evaluation to its stakeholder groups?

<sup>\*</sup>Provide a separate response for each question.

#### ESEA §1114 (b)(1)(F) Strategies to increase parental involvement in accordance with §1118, such as family literacy services

Research continues to show that successful schools have significant and sustained levels of family and community engagement. As a result, schoolwide plans must contain strategies to involve families and the community, especially in helping children do well in school. In addition, families and the community must be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the schoolwide program.

#### 2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Strategies to Address Student Achievement and Priority Problems

| Content<br>Area<br>Focus | Target<br>Population(s)       | Name of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success (Measurable Evaluation Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)  |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| ELA                      | Students with Disabilities    |                   |                       |   |  |
| Math                     | Students with Disabilities    |                   |                       |   |  |
| ELA                      | Homeless                      |                   |                       |   |  |
| Math                     | Homeless                      |                   |                       |   |  |
| ELA                      | Migrant                       |                   |                       |   |  |
| Math                     | Migrant                       |                   |                       |   |  |
| ELA                      | ELLs                          |                   |                       |   |  |
| Math                     | ELLs                          |                   |                       |   |  |
| ELA                      | Economically<br>Disadvantaged |                   |                       |   |  |
| Math                     | Economically<br>Disadvantaged |                   |                       |   |  |
| ELA and<br>MAth          | All Families                  | Parenting Classes | Social Worker         | 5% increase in the number of parents attending the workshops, as reflected in parent attendance sheets in | These standards encompass the understanding of human growth; the ability to work with diverse learners; strong communication |

| Content<br>Area<br>Focus | Target Population(s)            | Name of Strategy           | Person<br>Responsible   | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)  | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
|                          |                                 |                            |                         | 2012 and 2013   | skills; instructional planning; and the ability to create strong partnerships with parents, colleges, and the community.  |
| ELA and<br>MAth          | Families of At<br>Risk Students | I&RS Committee             | Parent<br>Meetings      | All parents of students who were recommended to the I&RS committee were asked to attend a meeting with the social worker, the team leader, and the student to discuss possible intervention and recommendations.  | These standards encompass the understanding of human growth; the ability to work with diverse learners; strong communication skills; instructional planning; and the ability to create strong partnerships with parents, colleges, and the community.   |
| ELA and<br>MAth          | All Parents                     | Parent Summer Orientations | Mandatory<br>attendance | All parents must attend an orientation each summer with the team leader to discuss and revisit the mission and climate – both academically and behaviorally of the school. 100% parent involvement is expected and mandatory.  This year 5 <sup>th</sup> grade parent s were asked to attend a five hour training to introduce the climate of Camden's Promise Charter School to the parents. | Draw on relationships with professional colleagues and students' families for continued guidance and support. Social relationships and collaborative opportunities can play a critical role in supporting teachers in managing disruptive behavior in their classrooms. We recommend that teachers draw on these relationships in finding ways to address the behavior problems of individual students and consider parents, school personnel, and behavioral experts as allies who can provide new insights, strategies, and support. Source — 1373 KB |

| Content<br>Area<br>Focus | Target<br>Population(s)  | Name of Strategy   | Person<br>Responsible | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes) | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|---|
| ELA and<br>MAth          | All Parents and Families | Back to School Night   | Principal             | Attendance Sheets  | Draw on relationships with professional colleagues and students' families for continued guidance and support. Social relationships and collaborative opportunities can play a critical role in supporting teachers in managing disruptive behavior in their classrooms. We recommend that teachers draw on these relationships in finding ways to address the behavior problems of individual students and consider parents, school personnel, and behavioral experts as allies who can provide new insights, strategies, and support. Source — 1373 KB |
| ELA and<br>MAth          | All Families             | 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> , and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter<br>Report Card pick-up | Principal             | Attendance Sheets  | Draw on relationships with professional colleagues and students' families for continued guidance and support. Social relationships and collaborative opportunities can play a critical role in supporting teachers in managing disruptive behavior in their classrooms. We recommend that teachers draw on these relationships in finding ways to address the behavior problems of individual students and consider parents, school personnel, and  |

| Content<br>Area<br>Focus | Target Population(s)                               | Name of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible  | Indicators of Success<br>(Measurable Evaluation<br>Outcomes)                            | Research Supporting Strategy (i.e., IES Practice Guide or What Works Clearinghouse)   |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
|                          |  |   |  |   | behavioral experts as allies who can provide new insights, strategies, and support. <u>Source 1373 KB</u>   |
| ELA and<br>MAth          | Community partnership and Educational Partnerships | New Jersey Academy for<br>Aquatic Sciences<br>CAUSE Explorers | # Students/Staff Involved – 10  # of Hours – 6 hours weekly afterschool and on Saturdays | Introduce students to world of Marine Biology through a docent program at the aquarium. | These standards encompass the understanding of human growth; the ability to work with diverse learners; strong communication skills; instructional planning; and the ability to create strong partnerships with parents, colleges, and the community. |

<sup>\*</sup>Use an asterisk to denote new programs.

#### 2015-2016 Family and Community Engagement Narrative

- 1. How will the school's family and community engagement program help to address the priority problems identified in the comprehensive needs assessment? To re-engage parents to understand new standards, AYP, to hold students accountable to high standards.
- 2. How will the school engage parents in the development of the written parent involvement policy? Parent survey, Parent Meetings
- **3.** How will the school distribute its written parent involvement policy? Yes, we have a parent handbook and parents are required to attend a mandatory summer parent orientation in July each year to receive it.
- **4.** How will the school engage parents in the development of the school-parent compact? Parents are required to attend a mandatory summer parent orientation in July each year to receive it. At that time the Team Leaders for each grade spend an extensive amount of time going over the handbook, especially as it pertains to new information added, and asking parents for feedback.
- 5. How will the school ensure that parents receive and review the school-parent compact? Parents are required to attend a Back to School Night in September, where they will receive the compact. If they do not attend the event, one copy will be sent home for them.
- **6.** How will the school report its student achievement data to families and the community? The information is reported at orientations in the summer and in our newsletter which comes out monthly.
- 7. How will the school notify families and the community if the district has not met its annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAO) for Title III? A letter is given and signed for at Back to School Night. If parent does not attend the letter is mailed to them.
- **8.** How will the school inform families and the community of the school's disaggregated assessment results? At back to school night this information will be presented to parents in the form of a power point presentation.
- 9. How will the school involve families and the community in the development of the Title I Schoolwide Plan? Parent Survey
- **10.** How will the school inform families about the academic achievement of their child/children? MAP scores are reported for the summer at Back to School Night. Next, parents are required to come in for the 1st 3rd marking period Report Cards and to conference with the teachers. Also if pressing issues exist parents are asked to come in for other meetings through the school year as needed.
- 11. On what specific strategies will the school use its 2015-2016 parent involvement funds? NA

<sup>\*</sup>Provide a separate response for each question.

#### SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF ESEA §(b)(1)(E)

#### ESEA §1114(b)(1)(E) Strategies to attract high-quality highly qualified teachers to high-need schools.

High poverty, low-performing schools are often staffed with disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are not highly qualified. To address this disproportionality, the *ESEA* requires that all teachers of core academic subjects and instructional paraprofessionals in a schoolwide program meet the qualifications required by §1119. Student achievement increases in schools where teaching and learning have the highest priority, and students achieve at higher levels when taught by teachers who know their subject matter and are skilled in teaching it.

**Strategies to Attract and Retain Highly-Qualified Staff** 

|   | Number &<br>Percent | Description of Strategy to Retain HQ Staff  |  |
|---|---------------------|---|--|
| Teachers who meet the qualifications for HQT,   | 52                  | Merit Pay Incentive Systems set in place this year. Also, CPCS has an extensive course reimbursement system for teachers who are looking to |  |
| consistent with Title II-A  | 100%                | expand their knowledge.   |  |
|   | 0                   |   |  |
| Teachers who do not meet the qualifications for HQT, consistent with Title II-A         | 0%                  |   |  |
| Instructional Paraprofessionals who meet the  | NA                  |   |  |
| qualifications required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)              | NA                  |   |  |
| Paraprofessionals providing instructional assistance who do not meet the qualifications | NA                  |   |  |
| required by ESEA (education, passing score on ParaPro test)*                            | NA                  |   |  |

<sup>\*</sup> The district must assign these instructional paraprofessionals to non-instructional duties for 100% of their schedule, reassign them to a school in the district that does not operate a Title I schoolwide program, or terminate their employment with the district.

## SCHOOLWIDE: HIGHLY QUALIFIED STAFF ESEA §(b)(1)(E)

Although recruiting and retaining highly qualified teachers is an on-going challenge in high poverty schools, low-performing students in these schools have a special need for excellent teachers. The schoolwide plan, therefore, must describe the strategies the school will utilize to attract and retain highly-qualified teachers.

| Description of strategies to attract highly-qualified teachers to high-need schools                  | Individuals Responsible |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Dr. Conway              |
| Advertisement in major newspapers throughout the area.   |                         |
| Participation in a variety of job fairs  |                         |
| Partnerships with Teach for America, to recruit teachers in areas of need.                           |                         |
| Teacher salaries are comparable with local districts, with a merit pay incentive program.            |                         |
| Also, CPCS has an extensive course reimbursement system for teachers who are looking to expand their |                         |
| knowledge.   |                         |